

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID RADEMAKER,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-0804 KJN P

vs.

A. HEDGEPEETH, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, has filed a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis. In light of 1996 amendments to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, this court will not rule on plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis.

The federal venue statute requires that a civil action, other than one based on diversity jurisdiction, be brought only in “(1) a judicial district where any defendant resides, if all defendants reside in the same State, (2) a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of property that is the subject of the action is situated, or (3) a judicial district in which any defendant may be found, if there is no district in which the action may otherwise be brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).


////

1 In this case, the defendants are located and the claim arose in Monterey County,
2 which is in the Northern District of California. Therefore, plaintiff's claim should have been
3 filed in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. In the interest of
4 justice, a federal court may transfer a complaint filed in the wrong district to the correct district.
5 See 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a); Starnes v. McGuire, 512 F.2d 918, 932 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 7 1. This court has not ruled on plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis; and
8 2. This matter is transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern
9 District of California.

10 DATED: April 14, 2010

11
12
13 
14 KENDALL J. NEWMAN
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15 rade0804.21a
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26